

*Papa* of 1380 (see reference to crusade of 1383 in no. xlvii. 136). There are also some other passages in English works sometimes attributed to him, which condemn celibacy (*S. E. W.*, in. 189-90; Matt., 7, top of page), but these may have been written by some other Lollard. The strong attitude of the Lollards on the question can be seen in *Fasc. Z.*, 361, in their petition to Parliament of 1395. Wai-densis in his *Doctrinale* represents Wycliffe as defending clerical marriage (Waldensis, ed. 1523, caps. 66-67), on the ground that Christ never forbid His apostles to marry.

Note 1, jp. 167

We have no means of calculating statistically the proportion the wealth of the Church bore to the wealth of the kingdom.

We have no calculation either of ecclesiastical or lay wealth at this period. We have only (I) a calculation of Church wealth in 1291, and (II) a calculation of Church wealth at the time of the Reformation.

(I) The pages of the *Ecclesiastics Taxatio* of 1291 (printed by command of his Majesty in 1802) have been summed up by Bishop Sfcubbs, the result being 210,644?. *9s. 9d.* (see St. ii. 580); a similar calculation of Canon Dixon's gives 218,8022. as the yearly income.

(II) The *Valor Ecclesiasticus* and Speed's calculations from it give the result of 320,280Z. as the yearly income at the time of the Reformation. We may safely suppose that the ecclesiastical income *ia* Richard the Second's reign lay somewhere between these two sums, say at about 270,000Z. But it must be remembered that this is exclusive of several very large sources of wealth enjoyed by the clergy :

- (i) Of the incomes enjoyed for secular employments by prelates in office under the King, and clerks engaged by business men. (ii) Money collected from laity by way of alms, by sale of indulgences! and all exceptional ways, (iii) The large fines, fees, and blackmail collected by the spiritual courts.

Such items as these it is impossible to estimate, and it is therefore impossible to estimate the annual income of the Church with any approximation to correctness. But even if we could, it would be of little use, for it is quite impossible to calculate the income of the laity and of the kingdom as a whole, and therefore the real proportion that Church wealth bore to the whole cannot be calculated either. Canon Dixon (*Church History*, ed. 1878, i. 250) chooses to estimate the revenue of the laity at about a million when the Church assessment of 1291 was taken. But he quotes no authority. When economic historians are uncertain whether the population was one and a half or three millions, how shall we attempt to estimate the national wealth, about which we know even less? Canon Dixon's comparison of lay and clerical wealth is in fact without any value. I am as little inclined to trust the word of contemporary Lollards that the Church possessed 'the more part \* of the temporalities of the kingdom besides the spiritualities and treasure. Mr. Wakeman thinks that the monasteries alone possessed 'about a third of the land of England,'<sup>1</sup>